REMARKS

[0001] Claims 1-21 are pending and stand rejected. The Office Action provisionally rejected Claims 1-21 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting. Claims 1-19 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 101 as being directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 18 and 19 were objected to for informalities. Claims 13 and 16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112 second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer et al., "Portlet Development Guide" Edition 1.1, pp 1-59, January 30, 2002 (hereinafter "Hesmer").

AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

[0002] Claims 1, 12, 16, 18, 20, and 21 were amended to clarify embodiments of the invention. Claim 3 was cancelled because the limitations of Claim 3 were incorporated into the preceding independent claim by amendment. Claim 13 and Claim 16 were amended to clarify claim language. The amendments will be addressed in relation to the corresponding rejections. Furthermore, Claim 5 was amended to be consistent with the amendment to Claim 1. No new matter has been added.

[0003] The Applicants wish to draw the Examiner's attention to independent Claims 12 and 18 that include additional limitations not found in the other independent claims. The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of Claims 12 and 18 on their own merits based on these additional limitations.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-21 UNDER DOUBLE PATENTING

[0004] The Office Action provisionally rejected Claims 1-21 on the grounds of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting over Application No. 10/527,135. Applicants

will file a terminal disclaimer. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-21 under double patenting be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-19 and 21 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §101

[0005] The Office Action rejected Claims 1-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101. The Office Action rejected Claims 1-11 and 16-19, arguing that the claimed apparatus could embody software components. Claim 1 and Claim 16 have been amended to clarify that the "the shared portlet application session object [is] stored on a memory and executed by a processor." This amendment finds support in the Specification in at least paragraph 131 which describes the parameter map as a memory object stored in the data store that is created per session. One skilled in the art realizes that a memory object that is stored is stored on memory that is executed by a processor.

[0006] Also, the Office Action rejected Claims 12-15, arguing that the claimed "Application" is also non-statutory. Claim 12 has also been amended to recite a memory and processor.

[0007] In addition, the Office Action rejected Claim 21 which claims "a computer readable signal bearing medium" as software per se. Claim 21 has been amended to recite a "computer readable storage medium." Consequently Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 1-19 and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 101 be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 13 and 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §112

[0008] The Office Action rejected Claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Specifically, the Office Action claims that the use of the term "etc." renders the claims indefinite. These claims have been amended to remove the term "etc." Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claims 13 and 16 under 35 U.S.C. § 112 be withdrawn.

REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-5 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

[0009] Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Hesmer. "Anticipation under 35 U.S.C. §102 requires the disclosure in a single piece of prior art of each and every limitation of a claimed invention. …Whether such art is anticipating is a question of fact." *Apple Computer, Inc. v. Articulate Systems, Inc.*, 234 F.3d 14, 20, 57 USPQ2d 1057, 1061 (Fed. Cir. 2000). It is well settled that under 35 U.S.C. §102 "an invention is anticipated if . . . all the claim limitations [are] shown in a single art prior art reference. Every element of the claimed invention must be literally present, arranged as in the claim. The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the patent claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co., Ltd.*, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

[0010] Hesmer is a guide to portlet development. As such, Hesmer seems to describe deployment descriptors, Hesmer 2.4, portlet applications which form logical groups of portlets, *id.* 2.1, portlet context name/value pairs, *id.* at 3.6, and PortletSessions, created for each portlet on a page, *id.* at 3.7.

Claim 1

[0011] Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 1 clearly recites features not taught or suggested in Hesmer. Claim 1 as amended states:

> 1. (Currently Amended) Apparatus for a portal server system for managing a collection of associated portlets responsive to user requests to access a web application, the apparatus comprising:
>
> a **shared portlet application session object** for saving parameters from user requests of associated portlets, the shared portlet application session object **accessible by each portlet** in a portlet application and configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to **share a common web application session**, the shared portlet application session object stored on a memory and executed by a processor; and

a portlet application communication client linked to said shared portlet application session object for communicating between said associated portlets and said web application to convey user requests received from said associated portlets to said web application **through** the **common web application session**.

Claim 1 as amended (emphasis added, strikethrough removed for clarity).

[0012] Claim 1 has been amended to clarify that a shared portlet application session object is used for saving parameters from user requests. Furthermore, the shared portlet application session object allows each portlet in a portlet application to share a common web application session. The amendments to Claim 1 are fully supported by the Specification in at least Fig. 2, ¶¶ 119 and 174-177 (describing a Portlet Application Session Object).

[0013] Hesmer does not teach "a **shared portlet application session object** for saving parameters from user requests of associated portlets, the shared portlet application session object **accessible by each portlet** in a portlet application and configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to **share a common web application session**." Hesmer seems to teach a PortletSession, which holds "user-specific data for the virtual instance of the portlet." Hesmer, sec. 3.7, p. 21. However, although a PortletSession is created for each portlet, Hesmer fails to teach or describe a shred portlet application session object accessible by each portlet as recited in amended Claim 1. Figure 2 of the Application shows a shared portlet application session object 208 that is shared by multiple portlets 205-207. A shared portlet application session object shared by the portlets of a portlet application allows the portlets to share a common web application session.

[0014] Advantageously, allowing portlets to communicate with the backend web application using a common web application session creates an enhanced information sharing environment between the portlet application and the web application. A common web application session allows session information to be relayed that is specific to the whole portal server (such as

language information, user agent information, etc) to the session information of the back-end web application. That means that the back-end web application is able to deliver the data-representation that conforms to all the requirements contained in the original request sent to the portal server by a user. *See* Specification, ¶ 179.

[0015] For example, if the user accesses the portal using a WAP (wireless application protocol) enabled mobile device, with default language locale set to "French," the original http request to the portal server (shown in Figure 2 of the Specification as element 201) will have its language parameter set to "French" and user-agent field of the HTTP header set to "WAP". A common web application session allows this local and device information to be relayed to the web-application (shown as element 221 in Figure 2). As a result of this session relaying, the web application returns a response in French that is suitable for display on the user's mobile device in French. Without a common web application session, the web-application would return the information in the default-language (for example English) suited for the default device (for example an Internet Browser) because the information from the original http request to the portal server would not be forwarded. Thus, a common web application session enables sharing between the portal server and the web application.

[0016] While Hesmer appears to teach a portlet application, which is a group of portlets, Hesmer fails to teach any concept of shared portlet application session object that allows the portlets of a portlet application to share a common web application session.

[0017] Because Hesmer fails to teach the limitations of amended Claim 1 including a "shared portlet application session object," Hesmer fails to anticipate Claim 1 as amended. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Claims 16 and 20 that includes similar limitations to Claim 1 are also allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 1. Furthermore, Claims 2, 4-11, 17, and

21 depend from independent claims that are allowable, as described above. *See In re Fine*, 837 F.2d 1071, 5 USPQ2d 1596 (Fed. Cir. 1988). Consequently Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent Claims 2, 4-11, 17, and 21 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

Claim 12

[0018] Applicants respectfully submit that amended Claim 12 clearly recites features not taught or suggested in Hesmer. Claim 12 as amended states:

> 12. (Currently Amended) A portlet application for managing a collection of associated portlets in a portal, for operating on a server providing access to a web application by a user;
>
> said associated portlets having portlet request parameter maps storing data and instructions from user requests to said portlets;
>
> a shared portlet application session object for said user for said associated portlets, the shared portlet application session object accessible by each portlet in a portlet application and configured to allow each portlet in the portlet application to share a common web application session, the shared portlet application session object stored on a memory and executed by a processor;
>
> a **shared portlet application session data store** controlled by said shared portlet application session object, the shared portlet application session data store configured to store request parameters from incoming user requests to each portlet in the portlet application;
>
> a portlet application communication client linked to said portlet application data store for communicating between said associated portlets and said web application through the common web application session to convey user requests received from said associated portlets to said web application; and
>
> said communication client having a request buffer for storing requests from portlet request parameter maps of said associated portlets to enable said communication client to provide data and instructions for said web application.

Claim 12 has been amended with similar limitations as Claim 1 as described above. In addition, Claim 12 has been amended to clarify that the portlet application session data store is shared by each portlet and that the shared portlet application session data store stores request parameters

from incoming user requests to portlets in the portlet application session. This amended is supported in the Specification by at least ¶¶ 119 and 131 of the Specification.

[0019] As described above, Hesmer appears to describe a portlet session and portlet session object. Hesmer also appears to describe storing user related data in a session object. Hesmer, page 5, third paragraph. However, Hesmer fails to teach a "shared portlet application session data store." Beneficially, the shared portlet application session data store allows the portlets in a portlet application to communicate with a single web application session on the backend asa described above and to pass all the parameters in the portlet session correctly to the backend web application. Thus, the requests of multiple portlets are effectively harmonized allowing for greater data sharing and inter-portlet functionality..

[0020] Because Hesmer fails to teach the all of the limitations of Claim 12 as amended including a "shared portlet application session data store," amended Claim 12 is not anticipated by Hesmer. Consequently, Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of Claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn. Furthermore, Claim 18 that includes similar limitations to Claim 12 is also allowable for at least the same reasons as Claim 12. Furthermore, Claims 13-15 and 19 depend from independent claims that are allowable, as described above. Applicant requests that the rejection of dependent Claims -15 and 19 under 35 U.S.C. § 102 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

[0021] In view of the foregoing, Applicants submit that the application is in condition for immediate allowance. In the event any questions or issues remain that can be resolved with a supplemental phone call, the Examiner is respectfully requested to initiate a telephone conference with the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: September 4, 2009

8 East Broadway, Suite 600
Salt Lake City, UT 84111
Telephone (801) 994-4646

_/ David J. McKenzie /_____
David J. McKenzie
Reg. No. 46,919
Attorney for Applicants